York Books : XX
Continuity Tracts

My People Love To have It so

A paper read before a joint Session of the Loyola Sodality and the Xavier Guild

Published at their request

BY ANGLICANUS

Loquere filiis Israel

ut proficiscantur

London
THE SOCIETY OF SS. PETER & PAUL
Publishers to the Church of England
32 George St., Hanover Square, and 302 Regent St., W.
1916

Price 3d.

My People Love to have it so

GENTLEMEN,—You have asked a stranger to address your reverend Society, presumably with the intention of hearing what he has to say. My gratitude is only equalled by my nervousness at finding myself confronted by so many learned and talented men who, I think, I am not rash in presuming are the successors of the Tractarians and now or in the immediate future the leaders of the Oxford Movement. If I have rightly judged your purpose in asking me here to-day, I will not disappoint you. I have certain things to say in connection with subjects in which you are interested, and some of them I propose to say without hesitation or fear of displeasing any of you. You have asked me not to deal with doctrinal or deep matters (that are too high for me), which I am given to understand you habitually debate among yourselves. I shall therefore put before you certain matters of practice about which I am greatly puzzled, and I have no doubt when this is done, I shall listen to your honourable selves and be no longer puzzled.

I have taken as my text: "My people love to have it so." It is the common answer of clergymen to any enquiry about points of practice upon which they have either not made up their august minds or in which they know themselves to be in the wrong.

"The people love to have it so!" Do they! Are you sure? I am surprised at your admission, for you are the teachers of the people, and if they like wrong things it is because they have not been taught better.

Let me bring out my whip of many lashes—I am convinced it will not draw any Xavier blood.

The Asperges

There is a Christian custom, dating at least from the tenth century, and adopted by the whole Church East and West, that before the principal Mass or Liturgy on Sunday water should be solemnly blessed, and with it the Priest, altar, and people aspersed. It is perhaps the most beautiful and teaching of all ancient ceremonies, reminding us of our Baptism, and the robe of innocence which is necessary for all who come together on the Lord's day to plead the Eternal Sacrifice. Here is a beautiful, helpful, elevating, teaching, most symbolical and Christian ecumenical ceremony. Here is a *Catholic practice*, and I know of *one* Anglican church in London which observes it! Gentlemen, I ask upon what principles is your worship and ceremonial conducted; what do you mean by loyalty to Catholic tradition and ecumenical custom? Has this pompous phrase any meaning at all? I have listened for many years to priests in ritualistic churches stating—"Catholic practices are our right and duty, we should be disloyal if we were to ignore them, traitors if we gave them up." It is true that this statement generally referred to the use of incense employed in a particular manner (and, strange to say, at Sung, not High, Mass).

Now that particular use is not Catholic—if you mean common to East and West; it can be very powerfully defended, but it is not ecumenical. The Asperges is Catholic and ecumenical. Why do you not use it in your churches? May I guess the reason? "The people love to have it so." I deny it, and with all respect I submit to you: Your practices are based upon no sound principle. A few men have said and a great Society has repeated: "There are six points. Adopt them and call them Catholic." You have done so without any consideration, and out of loyalty to a Society, but that Society is not the Catholic Church.

One last word: Incense is very beautiful, and appeals to the senses, it is right that we should have it in our churches, but there are a hundred English clergymen at least who would not sympathise with this Guild, but who would go cheerfully to the stake to-morrow for the triumph of incense. Let them do so. It will not be asked of them. But let the priests of this Guild who are interested in ceremonial intro-

duce this other practice which does not appeal to the senses, nor delight the eye, but is a practical reminder every Lord's day that those who come to the Holy Mysteries must first be washed from their sins that they may adore God with a quiet mind. You will perhaps be harried for a while, but you will have done something.

Saying of Mass

I pass from a subject of weekly interest to another of daily and more than daily importance—I mean to the method of celebrating Mass. Perhaps I may refer in this instance to the church which I have been in the habit of attending. It is a large one, with splendid congregations, hard-working and eloquent priests, and of some name in the history of the revival of Catholicism. There are at least two Masses every day, but I have never seen more than thirty people out of that large congregation attending them on a weekday. There are very few daily Communions. The people who come are leisured and pious, or leisured and old, or leisured and pious and old. The ordinary citizen—man or woman—is conspicuously absent. It is an appalling failure, and I marvel daily that the good priests can go on so quietly, making no fresh efforts, formulating no new schemes, devising no attractions to bring their people daily to the Lord, who will most assuredly do his work, when they have first done theirs. It is all so different in the case of mission services and clubs and Bible-classes. . . .

You have not asked me to debate this question, which I would gladly do, but I will mention some points which go far towards making these early Masses very different from those which in other places are daily thronged and frequented.

First. They are so long—the priests are quite half an hour at the altar, and one of them is more.

Secondly. They are not very intelligently rendered, and in spite of vestments, and a server in red (!), and much bell-ringing, are surprisingly unlike the Mass as it is traditionally rendered and dearly loved by Western Christians.

Thirdly. The Priest is too loud, or too quiet, too personal, or very provocative.

Each of these is a real fault, and each springs from the same source—the clergy know little of Liturgical Science, they

have never read nor practised for themselves, they have copied others who started with the same handicap.

Length of time is fatal. The workers could not come if they would. I well know they cannot spend half an hour or more, and they will not go out before the service ends.

I come to the other points. In this same church the Celebrant follows the excellent custom of saying the whole "Proper" of the Mass—Introit and Gradual and so on. There is a great value in the Proper. Take the Introit for example. These texts of Sacred Scripture specially appointed for every Mass, recited as they are some time before the Collect is said, give the first note to the special purpose of the particular Mass, and enable all from that moment to direct their intentions and concentrate their thoughts upon the chief petitions of Holy Church in offering that morning's sacrifice.

But the Priest reads the Introit in an undertone, to himself, and for his own benefit! while he cries aloud prayers which everyone hears daily and knows by heart. Is it not inane and incredible from the practical point of view? Liturgically, it is worse, for such a custom is unknown in any Rite, and the Proper is ordered to be read in a clear voice. If this is not done, it becomes a puzzling and annoying private devotion of the Celebrant, who has no business to say it at all.

The same thing may be said of the Gradual and other parts of the Proper; also of the Preparation, which is whispered between Priest and Clerk, and is most unedifying. The only preparation left to us in the Prayer Book—the *Our Father* and Collect for Purity—is said as a Kyrie or Gloria in Excelsis at the altar, long after the mumbling of the Introit. *The Lord be with you* is said in half the proper places. The proper Offertory is said silently after the Prayer Book one, the Secrets are added to the unending Church Militant Prayers, the Communion is whispered when the Priest finds time, and the Post-Communions—far removed from the Prayer Book Post-Communion—are read over silently, sandwiched between the Blessing and Last Gospel, for all the world as if they were Post-Ablutions, and had nothing to do with Communion at all. This is simply Liturgical suicide. Even if the people did know the structure of the Mass, how could they ever discover it in such services?

Creed and Gloria

I will now pass on to the question of the Creed and *Gloria in Excelsis.*

In my anonymous church, daily at every Mass, feria, fast, or festival, without intermission and with most misguided devotion, our clergymen recite the Creed and *Gloria in Excelsis.* Now the rule about this is strict and easily ascertainable. Simply stated, it is that these festival features of the Liturgy are said upon Sundays and Holy Days and *not at other times.* Any other practice is a defiance of all Liturgical precedent, and succeeds in making the English Liturgy appear both amateur and ridiculous. I have never met and rarely heard of anyone who will defend this strange habit, and the arguments they employ are quite unconvincing.

It is maintained: The Nicene Creed and Gloria are part of the norm of the Prayer Book Rite as we have it now, there are no directions to omit them, therefore they must always be said; or, the Bishop, when asked, ordered us to do so. It is the old game, when in difficulties abuse the Prayer Book or the Bishop. But both must first be treated with intelligence. It never seems to occur to our rubric-smashing vicars: For what occasions is the norm of the Prayer Book Liturgy arranged? The answer is: Sundays and Holy Days for which Epistles and Gospels are appointed. Exactly—it is upon such days that the Creed and Gloria are said.

The 1549 Rite provided for their omission on weekdays, workdays, and in private houses: the present Prayer Book provides the service arranged for only one of such occasions, viz., in private houses. And if you look at the Communion of the Sick you will note that, among other things, of course the Creed is ordered to be omitted. It is therefore quite wrong to ascribe this strange habit to Prayer Book orders, especially as to justify it, it is necessary to fall back upon a wholly Protestant and anti-Tractarian interpretation. If omission does not imply perpetual prohibition, insertion certainly does not prescribe diurnal recitation.

And then about the Bishop. "When asked, he ordered them to be said." This is not quite fair. Whoever thought of asking a bishop about the customs of Catholic Christendom? Quite probably he knows nothing about the rendering of

Liturgies, and would honestly admit that he had never read a word on the subject. Zualdi is a name unknown to him, he was brought up on the Act of Uniformity. He may never have worked in a parish at all, and most likely never in his life celebrated the Communion upon six consecutive ferias. Is it kind then, to put it mildly, to draw his opinion upon a technical point of Liturgical Science or practice, and so expose his weakness? For shame, gentlemen, Bishops are for you to respect, and admire, and honour in the realms of culture and learning; do not make of them stalking horses, sandbags, and red herrings. Besides, they are neither so unreasonable nor autocratic as it is the fashion to pretend; let principles be explained to them when they yearn to know, and give them time to think. But priests must be sure of their own ground and not explain: "Creed and Gloria are omitted at Black Mass because they are unsuitable." That is nonsense.

In any case you should refuse to be bullied into a practice which is at once unauthoritative and without Liturgical precedent.

The Communion Devotions

Before I come to the question of the Canon I must briefly mention the Communion Devotions, by which I mean the long and short Exhortations, Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words. (One or both of the Exhortations are universally omitted, so I will not bother you about them.) Now at every Mass there should, of course, be some to communicate with the Priest, in accordance with the express intention of Holy Church. This is not merely a local custom, it is everywhere desired. In the church I have spoken of, it frequently happens, as it often must, owing to late Masses and other causes, that there are no Communicants. The Priest makes no difference, he solemnly turns round and invites to Holy Communion people whom he well knows are unable at that time to receive the Sacrament and with whom he would not be very patient if they were to accept his invitation. I am sure you will agree with me that nothing is less desirable or more likely to produce an atmosphere of unreality. On such occasions, do you omit these devotions?

Benedictus, Agnus, and Proper Prefaces

Again, I must tell you that the *Benedictus* and *Agnus Dei*, which are quite boldly sung at High Mass, are muttered by the Priest at Low Mass as if he were ashamed of the sentiments. What is the point of this, why is it done ? Is there any authority ? On Saturdays there is a children's Mass with many " illegal " features—all of them are helpful and edifying. Proper Collects, Epistle, Gospel, Prayers and Hymns of Our Lady are all introduced, but the best and most excellent and no more " illegal " addition of all is not made. I mean the special preface of Mary, than which I know nothing in the English language more lovely or devotional. Why are we deprived of these glories that our churches once knew so well ?

Again, in the Prayer of Humble Access, the Priest, instead of coming down to kneel on the predella in the proper way, sinks on his knees against the frontal, holding the mensa with both hands. It is so undignified and unworthy of his office. Is this your practice ?

A Ritual Outrage

There is another and most deplorable custom which is prevalent at nearly all Masses with music and hymns. It is not easy to find a name for this, but you will all recognise what I mean. For instance, in the church which I have already mentioned, hymns or anthems are sung by the choir and people at many points in the Mass. Now it frequently happens that at the Preparation, Offertory, Consecration, or Post-Communion the Priest has finished doing what is necessary, and is prepared to go on with the Sacrifice—e.g., he has made the Offertory and completed it during the first two verses of " The Church's One Foundation " ; but instead of proceeding with the Lord's Service as the Prayer Book directs, he stands waiting and doing nothing at the altar, while three more interminable verses of the said hymn are finished. This is an extraordinary liturgical outrage, and nothing that could be invented is so well calculated to impress upon the faithful the subordination of the Divine Liturgy to modern popular devotions. I challenge any Anglican, High or Low, to produce any authority for this ritual distortion.

I have seen the Priest obviously waiting and delaying to begin the Consecration because the congregation are singing something. What is the point of this degradation of the Rite? "The people must hear the Church Militant Prayer and the Consecration." There is no need at all, quite the reverse. They can read it all in their books. But if this were so, why do they go on singing when they ought to be listening to words of infinitely greater importance? The people will never realise the awful dignity of the Service of the Mass so long as priests allow these objectionable modern customs to flourish in their churches.

The Canon

I come now to the Canon of the Mass.

To the Catholic layman I think the most trying thing of all is the Neo-Anglican method of saying the Canon of the Mass. I do not mind the insertion of large portions of the Latin Canon in any language preferred if it is said, as it should be said, "secrete" and does not lengthen the service; but I do protest most strongly against the common habit of treating the English Canon—and that part which consummates the Consecration is, of course, the most vital part of the Canon—as if it were no Canon at all. When the Priest comes to it, all considerations of English precedent, and Western custom, and Catholic tradition are thrown to the winds and he reads it aloud just as the Lutherans do. This is a still more determined attempt at Liturgical suicide. If the Consecration Prayer is not a Canon, then do not say it at all. If it is, say it as the Canon is always said, in the voice prescribed by authority. No sound reason for the opposite system is ever produced. "It is in the Prayer Book, and therefore must be said aloud," is simply a *non-sequitur*—the long Exhortation is in the Book and is never said at all. In England, as everywhere else in the West, the Celebrant for many centuries hushed his voice as he prepared to act the very part of Christ himself. It is a natural instinct and a suitable expression of proper sacerdotal humility. It is most impressive to the mind of the people, and teaches them, if anything ever does, the proper proportionate value of the Action and the words. It is no loss to them, for they can follow every ceremony with the eye and every word, too, if

they care to open their Prayer Books. Our rubrics as to the Priest's voice do not hesitate to express exactly what they mean. They say " with an audible voice " or, " with a loud voice " if it is intended to reverse an old custom ; e.g., at the Our Father before Morning and Evening Prayer, which would ordinarily be said " secrete." There is no such direction, no such alteration prescribed for the Consecration. Why, then, in heaven's name make the worst of it and interpret the rubrics as no Catholic would dream of doing ? Remember the Tractarian principle: Let old customs prevail when there is no Commandment to the contrary.

The Ablutions

There is one more point of importance, and I have done with this subject. I refer to the extraordinary practice of postponing the Ablutions to the end of the Mass. If stupid customs can do harm, this is certainly responsible for much false teaching. It destroys the whole ceremonial structure of the Liturgy in practice, if not in theory ; it strives to turn the Lord's Service into a kind of Benediction Devotion ; it succeeds in masking the supreme sacrificial aspect of the Mass ; it leaves everyone save the Priest in doubt as to whether the most holy Sacrament is still upon the altar or not ; or, worse still, it persuades some priests purposely to consecrate more than is required for Communion, in order that their ceremonies may be carried out as usual. When you consider that this practice has been based upon a misreading of an English rubric, the writer of which, Bishop Cosin, has left on record what his intention was, that it has been proved beyond the limits of discussion that this rubric was never meant to introduce a new custom quite out of harmony with Eucharistic tradition, that no Western Rite of to-day or yesterday or ever contemplated such a distortion, that whatever the Prayer Book's faults, it certainly never gave any countenance to intra-Liturgical cults—considering all this, is it not amazing how this nineteenth-century ceremonial monstrosity has established itself in churches loudly claiming to be Catholic ?

I must pass on to other matters which I find you have placed within my realm of discussion, but I am confident that as soon as these matters come to be set right, you will be in a better position to offer to the people who come to

your services the Mass, the old Mass as it ever was in England, and is among our neighbours all around us. Where it has been tried, it has always succeeded.

Regulation, Reservation, and Exposition

Nothing has so set back the revival of true religion among our people as the treatment which for the last fifteen years has been meted out in our churches to the most Adorable Sacrament of the Altar. I refer to the matter of Reservation. You know how in numerous churches the Tabernacle has been set right away in an obscure corner as far as possible from the haunts of men. Priests have gone through fire and water to introduce stoles and candles, vestments and incense, and finally after they have "got everything," as it is called, they look round to find a dwelling for the most high God. It is generally a chamber apart, or a chapel specially built, and then a request is made to the Bishop: "May I reserve?" Imagine a Catholic Priest asking a Catholic Bishop if he may do what every Catholic Curate is bound to do under pain of suspension! Is it to be wondered at that the Bishops who have watched this process going on have not yet learned what the Blessed Sacrament means to us or why we want Reservation? It would be astonishing if they had learned.

And so there is Reservation at St. Peter's in the East—perhaps in a dark and locked side chapel. What does this mean? From week to week the Holy Sacrament abides there, holding no court and receiving no liturgical worship, and perhaps once in three months is carried to the sick. No one ever receives Communion there but the Priest, perhaps no one else ever goes there at all. If this goes on for ten years—what is the result? I wish to speak with all possible reverence upon this subject, but I do not wish to avoid speaking what I know to be the truth. People may genuflect in that direction as they have been taught to do, they may talk about the Reserved Sacrament, and give outward homage, but they do not know that Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords, is there, and, moreover, as I know by experience, they do not realise that what is there is the same as the Divine gift they are given in Holy Communion. This is the sober truth, that a sort of fetish worship gradually supplants the heart's adoration. You will tell me that the Bishop is responsible

for this. I do not think so. How can he possibly know, unless *you* tell him—you who live on the spot. Point out to him at once how these rotten regulations are really defeating their own purpose. Could any other method you might devise, or any cultus you might indulge in, so successfully obscure the purpose for which the Sacrament was ordained? Every host ever consecrated is consecrated solely for the end of Communion. Who would think so looking at our deserted Sacrament chapels, our padlocked and curtained shrines, our Tabernacles built far from the bodies of the faithful! Bring forth then the King of Glory, and set his throne upon an altar where the living throng, where his subjects may visit him in his humility, and where, above all, not only during the Liturgy the leisured may receive him, but at any moment the workers may run in for their Daily Food and Sustenance, to be united not merely Soul to soul in intimacy of prayer, but Body to body in the Sacrament of love. Then at last Reservation will mean to the Englishman not a seventh point, but the CHILDREN'S BREAD.

You will expect me to say something upon the question of Exposition and Benediction, yet I feel there is little I need say. Does any one of you doubt that the Personality of our Lord will convert the sinner who is brought to him? Do you really think a mission service and sermon by the vicar can do what Christ himself will do? Remember these are the known, sure, tried, proven Catholic methods of prayer; proven not by Pope or General of Jesuits, but by the experience of every Catholic priest and peasant in every Western province of the Old or New World. We cannot do without them if we are to make any headway. "But the Eastern Church does without them." I know it well, and so would I, if I were "Orthodox," but I am not, and these Eucharistic devotions are a certain and necessary consequence of the great Elevation in the Western Mass.

"It must not be done without the Bishop's leave." The objection is unworthy of men who owe everything that has been won to priests whose splendid disobedience dragged us from the mire of formalism and negation. Besides, that is a distinctively Roman Catholic rule based upon their own principles of jurisdiction, and since when have Anglican Bishops learned the virtues of Baldeschi? Upon the same

principle every ceremony revived in the teeth of the Bishops has been an act of sin—ask any Roman Catholic canonist. But if your Ordinaries like these regulations, quote them some more, and in this matter meet them half-way. Exposition and Benediction with the Ciborium are practised without any permission from the Ordinary; there is presumed the *tacit* consent of the Bishop, and that at least you have to a very marked degree.

"Benediction is the Evening Service of the Church invented by God the Holy Ghost, but the time is not yet ripe for it." I do not accept either statement, or I could never remain in this Communion with any good faith. But that it is the service we need, the service the people cry out for, and the service our Lord loves, that it is the service we ought to have to-night—that I believe.

The Service of Good Friday. Which is it?

The Three Hours? Litany? Stations of the Cross? Morning or Evening Prayer? or Ante-Communion? Which is the service which sums up our worship on this great day? Most people think it is the Three Hours, but that is simply a loving devotion paid by friends of Christ to his Passion. The same may be said of the Stations. Neither is in the Prayer Book nor prescribed by the Church; they are lovely but not liturgical. What does the Prayer Book offer? Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany. But are these ever the principal services of any day? Not if we are true to our Lord's dying Memorial. And is not our Prayer Book true? We must look again, and we find prescribed the ancient Collects, Epistle, and Gospel for the Mass. True to our Lord, true to the traditions of the Universal Church, the Prayer Book shows that on Good Friday, as on every other day of the year, our Liturgical worship is gathered up in the Communion. Many churches call their service the Ante-Communion; it would be better to call it the Anti-Communion or the Ante-Non-Communion, for there is no Communion at all. This service is not the custom either at St. Peter's, Rome, or St. Paul's, London, or in any Cathedral of the Greek Rites on Good Friday. But are there no special customs on that day which bind us if we accept ecumenical practice and Catholic consent? Certainly, and very impressive and noticeable they are.

My People Love To have It so

1. Following the practice at the Last Supper when our Lord and his Apostles alone received Holy Communion, only the principal priest or officiant in all parishes receives the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

2. The Canon or Consecration is not said on Good Friday, for the Church has considered that a perpetual act of joy and thanksgiving, unsuited to the mournful day.

There is nothing among the Prayer Book rubrics for Good Friday to show that either in the service or principal ceremonies of the day, the English Church has forsaken these laudable customs of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

I have read you a short statement written down some years ago for the benefit of a provincial congregation. But I cannot leave this matter there. St. Paul's Cathedral may not have the Mass of the Presanctified, but at least it has the Communion. But what about our Anglo-Catholic churches ? Every sort of novelty service is performed on Good Friday, every imaginable Anthem from the Latin Rite is rendered into English verse, every conceivable ceremony is carried out to approximate the service to the Roman model except the Communion of the Body of Christ. Yet that is the one thing necessary, the only thing ecumenical. Again I ask: What do you mean by the word " Catholic " ?

Ritualism

I have a few words to say on the subject of present-day " Ritualism " (as it is called), for I believe it to be a real and growing danger. The late Tractarians or first Ritualists undoubtedly employed ceremonial as the handmaid of Catholic Truth—it is rapidly becoming the mistress. There are quite a number of churches, which in those days knew what it was to have the most Holy Sacrament throned on their altars, where Christ's children thronged around him as he passed borne in the hands of his Priests, where devout congregations waited for him to impart his solemn Benediction to them all. What happens in these shrines to-day ? By a gradual process of episcopal pressure weakly yielded to, the Tabernacle has been taken right away from the church, the Master is no longer always with his disciples, the opportunities for Eucharistic adoration have grown less and less. What has taken its place? The people must have a substitute ; it was necessary to keep

up their enthusiasm, and so when Benediction ceased, copes appeared at Evensong! When the Tabernacle was emptied and screwed up, next Sunday all the acolytes appeared in red flannel cassocks; when the natural depression seized the people, a revival of enthusiasm was engineered by the happy institution of—Processions! So it has gone on developing—you may not find a liturgical procession on the days prescribed—Candlemas, Palm Sunday, Good Friday, etc. (believe me, there is no principle in the matter)—but at least on every red-letter day, and every eve, and every octave, you will surely find a noisy wandering of banners and candles and cassocks round the church, accompanied by the tunes of specially elongated hymns, and always concluded by the Vicar in a cope. It is a sorry substitute. "These processions are very common in San Marino"—perhaps they are, so are bull fights at San Sebastian. I have never yet discovered any ecclesiastical habit which cannot be justified by the method of Cook's Tours or the appeal to Garibaldi. But there is nothing Catholic about them. Father Stanton once said to me in his inimitable way, speaking of processions: "What's the good of them? It would be different if they carried an old bone or something for the people to worship." I am afraid he was referring to processions of relics, but I cannot pretend I was shocked. Yet I fear "Evensong, Sermon, and Procession" will still be the hallmark of the Anglican Festa.

Now set against all this the extraordinary laxity about matters of Catholic consent and ecumenical tradition. I will mention two points which rest on the same authority. I mean fasting Communion and the marriage of Priests. The universal Church rules: (1) A Christian in good health must not receive Holy Communion after food. (2) A Priest must not contract Matrimony.

Do you hold yourselves bound by the laws of the Catholic Church?

Confirmation Age

I believe it is a subject upon which nearly all clergymen agree that whatever is right about the age for Confirmation, the present Anglican practice is quite wrong. Then why is nothing done to change it? A great many of your brethren are no doubt searching about for a better method—this is not your case. You know what you believe, you know the practice

of the holy Church, you only wish to obey plain Prayer Book directions. When a child knows the Creed, Lord's Prayer, Ten Commandments, and Catechism, you ought to present him or her to the Bishop to be confirmed by him. Why do you not do so ?

You have everything on your side on this question, right, rubrics, precedent, tradition, and law. The Bishop, if he is unwilling, has only a remark in his diocesan Calendar to which he can refer you. These remarks have not the force of Canon Law—they may be only his opinion, formed after debate with his domestic chaplain or a few other Bishops. He is as much bound by Canon Law as you are. You have promised him Canonical obedience, obey him then according to the Canons. It would do much towards ending friction between Episcopate and Clergy, if every time a Bishop autocratically demanded your obedience to his pronouncements, you very respectfully and quite in the spirit of a " friendly action," asked him to produce his Canon. Try it.

Now I am sure you know by experience the number of boys who are lost to the Church shortly after Confirmation ; you will agree with me that the number would be strikingly smaller if these boys had on their side, instead of, perhaps two years of sin and no Sacraments, five years of regular Penance and Communion. (As things are, I cannot understand why Confession is postponed till Confirmation.) I should like to ask then why your children are not confirmed at seven or nine or when they are ready ? Why are not parents continually instructed in this matter from your pulpits ? Why is no ultimatum addressed to recalcitrant Bishops ? If souls depend upon this reform, no action on your part can be delayed or be too strong. If there is any real difficulty in obtaining the Sacrament of Confirmation, there is certainly no difficulty in giving Holy Communion to all who are ready and desirous to be confirmed. This is the ordinary practice of Western Christendom ; it is not uncommon among ourselves ; let it become customary.

Reform of Methods

There are a few more points to put briefly before you while I am speaking about Practice. The statement is frequently made by laymen that many priests practise one religion in their

studies and confessionals, another in their pulpits and chapels. They do not mean quite as much as their statement conveys, but there is a danger in talking one language, or practising one system, in one place and another in another.

E.g., laymen do not like always to be set the Rosary as a penance in a church where the Rosary is never recited. They do not care to hear extolled the brevity and beauty of Roman Catholic services, when they are forbidden to attend them and cannot hear High Mass in their own churches under seventy-five minutes. They do not like a devotion to the Holy Father expressed by the Priest of a church where the Pope is perhaps never even prayed for.

These are surely mistakes, for they create an atmosphere of unreality which the good layman does not care to breathe for very long. We all know where he goes, and I think this is often the first cause.

Is it not possible that you can revise your practice in these respects? The Rosary is a good old English Devotion, it is quite popular, the Bishop of Chelmsford has lately blessed a modified and perhaps somewhat unauthorised form of it, our old churches would welcome it back, it is quite as legal as, and far more devotional than selected Vespers from the Breviary or anti-aircraft intercession services. Then why not say it?

Why forbid your faithful to hear the Latin Rite? Your prohibition has no effect, and they will learn much. You cannot seriously talk of "Schism and Italian Missions" while you remain in communion with the Bishops of Canada; the bubble of Territorial Jurisdiction, grossly inflated by a few of your predecessors, has been finally lanced by a skewer from Oxford. Reform your own services and make them as attractive and brisk as those of your Latin brethren—that is the only solution.

And in ordinary parish churches, do let us get rid of the surpliced choir. This is the barrier between the altar and the people. They will love the Mass when they sing it themselves, they will at the most only attend it so long as twenty boys and ten men do their heroic best with the Messe Solennelle of Juno —as the verger called him. From almost every point of view, artistically, musically, devotionally, numerically, spiritually, I believe the herding of a robed multitude in an English chancel is the wrong thing, tending to formalism and crushing natural

devotion. When your church seats a thousand people, a choir may be helpful for the solemn rendering of the Liturgy.

And is it not a standing reproach to every one of us that, go where you will, throughout the length and breadth of the Anglican Communion there is no Cathedral, no Abbey, no Monastery, no church where the Lord's Service is solemnly offered every day? Some of our great churches have choir foundations, many have choir schools, some sing the Offices, some sing Evening Prayer—the one bond of Anglican union between them all is: We do not sing the Lord's song. In a strange land there would be reason enough, but this is Mary's dowry and England of the Saints. We have the churches and we have the endowments, but where is the solemn offering? Let us give all honour to the Cathedral church of the Latin Archdiocese of Westminster, that in our very midst it does exhibit this ideal from which we have fallen, and does have a care for much we have forgotten.

A Great Church

If there is one vision that haunts my mind in every hour of waking it is this, that one day there will arise here in London a great Cathedral or Oratory of the English Rite, built in the very centre of the ever-growing metropolis. It may be just a vast shell of undecorated concrete, and roof over an altar stone set in a frame of deal. For decades it may stand naked of marble and mosaic, of gilding and of craftsmen's skill, but at least day by day from earliest dawn there will be heard the murmur from many altars of sacrifice, at least morning and evening will be chanted our Office with a dignity which will disarm its critics; at least hour by hour the confessionals will be open to the sinner; and then, above all, every morning will surely see the Solemn Offering of the Immortal Sacrifice. It would be something accomplished before we come to die.

Our jejune Liturgy would appear not perfect, but at least not unpresentable; the personality of the Priest would be lost in the greatness of his labour, and all petty functions, church politics, squabbles, and cabals would appear in their true perspective.

The Pope

But what about the Pope? Again, cannot you revise your methods? At least he is the chief Bishop, the Primate of

Christendom, the Successor of Peter; to him we owe our faith and foundation; at least as individual congregations we desire no quarrel with him. He is the Father of our fellow-Catholics in the Empire and in the West, and could do more for reunion than any Bishop in Christendom. Yet he is never mentioned, save for purposes of controversy. In scarcely a church is he openly the subject of our prayers. He may live and call councils, or be elected and die, yet not a Mass is offered, nor an intercession is heard nor a commemoration made. This is an inverted ultramontanism as uncharitable and futile as inverted snobbery.

Kikuyu

The mention of Charity brings me to another point upon which I have been asked to say something. The subject is not exactly fresh, but it is fairly topical—I mean Kikuyu. I know that a great many of you feel very keenly always about this, and are working very stoutly in the cause of Truth. I am entirely in sympathy with your feelings and your work, but I am frankly out of sympathy with much that is being said about the faith and work and worship of our Nonconformist brethren.* They are not Catholics, nor the lights of the world, but many of them are of the salt of the earth; and the experience of a childhood spent in the country villages of England teaches me that they have really suffered and been persecuted for the faith that is in them. The children of the Church, where it is in the ascendancy, are not always conspicuous for charity of heart and lips, and I think it is a wonderful thing that Dissenters should come to our altars. Do not misunderstand me. I think it is utterly wrong in principle that they should receive Holy Communion at the altars of the Catholic Church, neither discerning the Body nor holding the Faith; in practice I would certainly refuse them. I would quite dispassionately excommunicate the priests who invited them; but if you want me to *feel* strongly about it, I confess *I* am not

* And I might use "Nonconformist" in its widest sense, for I understand that this controversy has already given birth to a pamphlet which, by way of "defending the faith," denies the *validity* of the Holy Sacrament as received to-day in the Latin Rite, i.e., as we received it in the Church of England before the Reformation, and as most Catholics receive it now! Surely we shall exclaim *Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis.*

able. I do not think we have gone backwards. In the eighteenth century every Nonconformist was obliged to communicate at our altars against his will, under pain of fine or imprisonment; the State and the Archbishops of Canterbury left him no choice. In the twentieth century a few Nonconformists of their own will receive Communion at a church in Africa, and the Archbishop of Canterbury says it is very pleasing to God, but it must not happen again. The parallel is perhaps not perfect, but I think there is a sign of improvement. Let us work and pray that at the next Lambeth Conference a further improvement will be noted, and that the Archbishop will say: I am glad you should desire the Sacraments, but you must first hold the Catholic Faith and submit to the Catholic Church. When he says that, he will only be saying what all Catholic Bishops have always said, and that is the least we can rest content with. But I would remind you that the famous letter of the Bishop of Zanzibar dealt with three points, and this is only one. The others are quite as important:

We are obliged to remain in open communion with some priests who publicly teach that Christ's Body did not rise from the dead, that he was not born of a Virgin, and that the Sacrament of the Altar is not his true Body and Blood.

We are obliged to remain under the jurisdiction of some Bishops who openly question the teaching of the Undivided Church, who set their own opinion against the voice of the Apostolic College, and who lose no opportunity for hindering the revival of Catholic Practice. If you would realise how really serious this question is, I will ask you to read for yourselves an article by an English Bishop in one of the best-known Monthly Reviews for November, 1915. I see that you understand to what I am referring. I am much relieved, for it would be quite impossible to quote among any gathering of Christians the horrible passage I have in mind. Suffice it to say that a Bishop who annually receives a large sum of money for Apostolic work in feeding the flock of Christ, has here gone out of his way to parody and ridicule in public print the faith of all Catholic Christians as to the reality of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Altar. Such an action by any man would be indecent and unsocial, and would mock the Charity of Christ. In the special circumstances of this case, I can only say that our passionate indignation and resentment

have no bounds. So far as I know at this moment, no Bishop or Dignitary or Vicar has uttered a protest, or made any remonstrance against this shocking profanity.

If things of this sort are suffered to pass without notice, I cannot think that "Kikuyu agitations" will convince the earnest-minded Laity.

Again, we look on, apparently with equanimity, at the Dominical spectacle of practically every Anglican Cathedral and official church throughout the world substituting as the chief service of the day the worship of the synagogue for the Continual Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ. I confess these things cause me far more misgiving than the whole matter of Kikuyu.

Mannerism and Mockery

The attractions of Kikuyu have led me rather far from the questions of method which we were discussing, but before I leave the subject there is another matter which I feel called upon to mention. I mean the modern clerical manner in talking and writing and speaking. I am sure you will all understand to what I allude, but it is not easy to characterise in language except perhaps by the somewhat expressive word "Slop." Yet this is exactly what is spoken by clergymen, to clergymen, of clergymen. Thus are they represented on the stage in a manner that would amaze the most anti-clerical country in Europe, and priests accept it, they sit down under it, and finally they pander to it, and become "sloppy." The deacon says "I do feel," the priest says "One learns—does one not?" the Bishop, "I am profoundly convinced," when all of them mean "I think." All of them unite in: "We stand in a very real sense at the parting of the ways," when they really mean, "We ought to do something." I believe the fashion began with the episcopal New Year's letters. You all know the style: "Another cycle has sped, with all its memories the old year has departed, and before us lie the hopes and fears of to-morrow. Autumn has strewn the ground with the dead leaves of winter, reminding us of new responsibilities to be undertaken with a cheerful, glowing heart. Already the natives of Africa are white unto the harvest," etc. etc. National emergencies call forth even more trying efforts. "You are going to bless the banners of those lads who so

bravely and buoyantly uphold the honour," etc. etc. Apart from the fact that soldiers don't carry banners in Flanders, and so cannot have them blessed, Englishmen don't really like that sort of thing. It does not impress them—it sounds so unreal. I am not trying to be unpleasant, I am putting it mildly. A don at Oxford described my last quotation as " tawdry and alliterative Journalese." So it is. Can you imagine English Bishops at any other time in our history saying this sort of thing ? What would St. Augustine have said ? or Anselm, or Bonner, or Latimer, or Ken, the Caroline, Georgian, or Victorian Bishops ? Can you imagine the present Bishop of Oxford writing in this style ? There is so much consolation, perhaps, but this is a growing canker, and is not confined to any school of thought.

I have heard an Anglican Vicar at a public luncheon fresh from the mayonnaise and claret cup, in proposing a health say, " It was you, my dear Rector, who taught me to love the dear Lord." It was done in all sincerity and without any sense of self-consciousness, but half his audience blushed. Oxford may teach us to carry our reticence too far, but I am sure the Englishman is right when he calls such things " bad form." This spirit has invaded the Catholic clergy among the rest—not many years ago I attended the gathering of a large Catholic confraternity ; there were several hundred people present to listen to a speech from the President. It was a great opportunity to give them bread, but he brought forth butter in a lordly dish. For half an hour we were treated to a highly emotional speech of sickly sentimentality, and of course at the end, to the accompaniment of much arm-waving, we were invited to look at " the silver lining to every cloud, and as the storm blows the rain-clouds o'er, there in the rift is the streak of blue, and every raindrop sparkles like a dewdrop," and so on, and so on. It was even worse than that. I watched the audience carefully. A large number of women looked as if their ears were being tickled, a few people laughed, but the majority seemed to be really uncomfortable. I felt quite sick. Now someone ought to tell that clergyman not to do it, just as you would warn a man in the Tube that his bootlace was undone, or that he had come out without his trousers. It is only fair ; but no one will, and so it goes on, and others copy him. Let us guard ourselves before we are overtaken. I am sure

this atmosphere is unhealthy for the spread of the Truth among Englishmen.

The Bishops

You have asked me to say something about our relationship to the Bishops—a subject which is, I know, constantly on your minds, and is by no means an easy one to speak about. I am certain the difficulties can only be solved in time—it is useless to expect to tidy things up in a moment. Now I imagine that it is impossible to find anywhere any body of men who have in their minds a more exalted ideal of the office of a Bishop in the Church of God than yourselves. It is therefore all the more difficult for you to find yourselves in a position in which you are in conscience bound to be more or less in opposition to them on many questions. Our Lord gave the Bishops whom he was going himself to appoint some special charges, two of which I will recall to you. He told them: "The Good Shepherd knoweth his sheep and is known of them," and "The Princes of the Gentiles lord it over them—*but it shall not be so among you.*" First, then, is it not a continual shame, that in hardly any English diocese to-day is it even possible for the Bishop to know his sheep or be known of them? And yet there are some who have actively opposed the suggested division of their dioceses, some who have never moved in the matter at all! Nor are we without instances of some who have lorded it over God's heritage. Every priest ought always to have in his mind these ideals, if we are ever to restore in England the right view of a Bishop's office and work.

When we come to the question of the friction between English Bishops and their priests, we must first be eager to admit that the faults have not been all on one side. Priests have frequently rendered to their superiors either too much or too little or the wrong thing. They have yielded to them in great matters when the higher law should have made them pause; they have yielded to autocratic demands in small matters where "de minimis non curat lex" would well have met the case, but they have done it all with a bad grace and often been neither open, nor kindly, nor respectful.

It seems that you must be prepared to give to your Bishop, first, obedience according to the Canons, and also your esteem and reverence, your help and kindness, your affection and your

love where it is possible ; but, I think, experience shows that in matters of faith and practice at least you cannot give them your trust. Remember Newman's pathetic cry: "We have trusted them, and they have failed us." The leaders of the Church revival who remained with us, and have left their names to be cherished by us, were not men who had put their trust in Bishops. It was far otherwise. They realised then, as you do now, that the State may appoint any dignitary, that you have ever known or heard of, to be the next Bishop of this diocese. We have reason to know the great grace given by Consecration, but it does not alter human nature, it does not confer the gift of orthodoxy. And the new Bishop will rightly claim all that obedience you have rendered to the last. This is the best reason for looking before leaping.

In evidence given before a Royal Commission, one Bishop spoke of the "dangers of adoration" of the most holy Sacrament. It is not easy to forget such things when you receive an order in the matter of Reservation. On the other hand, I am quite sure it is never fair to a Bishop that he should be kept in the dark. Tell him what you believe, what you want to do, are doing, and are going to do. Tell him why and wherefore, and certainly trust him as far as you would trust any gentleman that he will not abuse your confidence. There is no reason to have any fear of this course. You have, if I may say so, one solid advantage over every other school of thought I have encountered, that you are really far removed from all the time-serving and intriguing, longings and carpet-lickings, plotting and eye-service which is every moment working to obtain that blessed thing—*Preferment.* This is a great gain ; cherish and increase it.

Present Disaffection

I should like, if I may, to sum up your case under three heads—there is no call for you to accept what I shall say, but I submit as the reasons for your sometimes rebellious thoughts the following :

1. *Injustice.* There is a deep and rankling sense of injustice as to the way the Catholic clergy and churches are treated by authority both in matters of doctrine and discipline.

E.g. (*a*) If a priest were openly to commend Papal Infallibility in the most strictly limited sense, and treating it as

quite another question from what is ordinarily meant by the rejected "Papal Claims," he would be inhibited and branded as disloyal, though the English Church has never considered the dogma nor spoken on it since its promulgation in 1870. If he were to use the word "Transubstantiation," which has ecumenical authority, or to employ the language of St. Bernard about the Mother of God, it is equally probable that he would be inhibited, and certainly reprimanded; but a clergyman can retain his benefice in a neighbouring diocese after he has published a book in which he allows that Christ is the Son of God, but questions if he is God the Son. He is not inhibited by his Ordinary, who is not averse from inhibiting, he is not publicly rebuked, not a Bishop says a word. Where is the sense of proportion? Are your Bishops more anti-Roman than they are pro-Christ? I purposely state an extreme case, but there are less obvious and more annoying ones every week.

(*b*) If any priest and congregation, out of zeal for Catholic Truth, openly expresses extra-liturgical devotion to the Holy Sacrament, they will be ardently pursued and bitterly persecuted (though, in Canon Law, a parish priest who fails to reserve the Holy Sacrament and the Archdeacon who tolerates the laxity, merit suspension for several months), while churches which are a scandal for barrenness and laxity may go their disloyal way undismayed.

I hold in my hand the service paper of a church not many furlongs from this building. It is to be noted that there are no weekday services, that the Communion is never celebrated before eleven o'clock, but three times a month in the evening. I doubt if the Rector has ever had a reprimand for continuing in so amazing a fashion.

There is a notice inviting *all* to the Sacraments in this Church—note it well—the incumbent is not ordered to remove it; but let him placard up in large letters: "The Blessed Sacrament is in this church day and night for the benefit and worship of the faithful, Mass is said three times every day, and the confessionals attended at any hour." I think within forty-eight hours he will receive a mitred envelope.

These are just random examples, but is it possible to trust an authority thus exercised?

2. My second head I will call *Morals*. Though it is not exactly descriptive, it will serve.

With perhaps a few exceptions, your consecrated leaders are nearly always in opposition to the Church and yourselves in certain matters of morals.

The observance of fasts, the rigid fast before Communion, the sin of schism, heresy, divorce, marriage within the prohibited degrees, the fencing of the altar, the necessity for children's Communion and Confession, the insistence on confession of mortal sin, in all such matters you can expect no backing, you must fortify yourselves behind against treachery. Any day one of you may receive a public rebuke (and be unable to reply) for refusing Absolution and Holy Communion to people who commit certain sins which the world does not consider sins at all. No Christian in any other province of the Church—East or West—could do such things and be welcomed at the altar, but here (it has happened) the attack is directed against the priests and the confessional, perhaps only approved, but perhaps even led episcopally. The seal of the Sacrament prevents any explanation, and sin gains the victory.

How can you respect an authority which, however indirectly, condones immorality ?

3. *Reactionary attitude.* In the nineteenth century, which is not necessarily very long ago, a Bishop of Winchester referred to the mildly ritualistic priests of his day as " these filthy reptiles which creep about our altars, leaving their slime wherever they go." The practice of Exposition and Benediction to-day would not provoke such language, you would mind little if it did. This is a sign of progress, yet, with some few exceptions, the English Bishops have steadily and blindly from the earliest days of religious revival set themselves in active opposition to reform and to the return to Catholic ways. It is true they are tolerant of incense and vestments to-day, *because they have been defeated;* yet incense and vestments never converted one soul, and are merely, as it were, evacuated trenches scarcely worth occupying in a general advance, but the Blessed Sacrament is the centre of immutable truth—Jesus Christ himself, who can lead captive every soul that may be brought to him. You will have no other purpose than this in your use of the Holy Eucharist, but this is your belief, and your practice will most certainly follow it. You do not admire incumbents who press for attractive ceremonial and neglect the proven methods of soul-winning used in all Western

churches. In view of our history, our progress, and these simple facts, cannot authority see how hopeless is the battle it is waging ? Will it even now prefer to be found vainly attempting to thwart Catholic progress ? Why not encourage, lead, and guide ? But in this connection, it is necessary to utter a note of warning. If you attack and carry a well-fortified trench, a favourite scheme of the beaten defenders is to hold up their hands and cry " Comrade." People who cry " Comrade " should always be treated with politeness, and any assistance they may be able to give to the general advance should be warily and readily accepted, but it is not wise to set them in the forefront of the next attack, or to ask and expect them to lead it. They *may* be quite anxious to do their best, but their previous history must not be forgotten, or it is not unlikely they will find some means of thwarting the whole attack. We have taken several trenches of Protestantism ; let us not rely upon others to finish the victory for us, or there may be no victory.

You are ready and eager to reverence authority, but in so far as that authority believes " the Church " to be these few Anglican provinces, sets thirty-nine articles above Catholic consent, and rules without Synod or Canon, you absolutely from your conscience repudiate and loathe it.

Have I put your case fairly ?

Dignitaries and the Layman

I have one more subject before I come to a conclusion. I know that some of you are frequently tempted to despair of the future when you breathe the atmosphere of official Church of Englandism. Dull, fat, pompous, and heavy respectability has so established itself and dug itself in, that sometimes the hope of reform and the ideal of a Church of the People seem as far off a dream as Merry England. By way of cheering you I will ask you to look at Convocation. There is a large sample of the atmosphere you find most stifling. Look again. There are in that gathering at least two very tiresome schools of thought. The first school has in some way survived the happy days of wigs and simony, and is definitely set against all real reform ; it will go the way of all good Whigs, its memory will be cherished like Simeon's by trustees. The other school represents the younger men, and is not at all pleased with you. You

are quite impossible—you are out of touch with modern thought—the layman in the street can't swallow your doctrines, he hates your ecclesiastical pranks; there is no hope for you unless you will lay aside your creeds and Canons, and try to justify Jonah to the layman.

Don't be alarmed, gentlemen, at these strictures; wait and see. What does the layman think of these up-to-date dignitaries? I think I can show you. May I quote you a brief paragraph from a weekly paper which has a happy manner of expressing the thoughts of the layman?

This is from "Truth" of July 14th in this year:

> "The ponderous imbecilities of the Canterbury Convocation have for many years excited the derision and contempt of beholders, and last week the Lower House surpassed itself in absurdity and fatuity. The members were invited to declare that the profession of arms is 'an honourable vocation.' Such nursery twaddle is positively exasperating at the crisis of a European war in which this country is fighting for existence. The Dean of Canterbury, who is a practical man, denounced one of the resolutions on this subject as 'pale and ghost-like,' and as being 'the baldest possible platitude.' I wonder what such prelates as Archbishops Tait, Magee, and Temple, or Bishop Creighton would have said to such provoking nonsense, worthy only of an assembly of sentimental schoolgirls."

I think you will not give up hope, for before long the average English layman will be entirely with you in your earnest desire to apply the principles of hygiene to the stuffy stables of officialism.

Reformation from Without

And how is it that we learn so little from the history of the misfortunes of our sister-Churches? The Churches of Italy, France, and Portugal have all, within living memory, suffered serious reverses at the hands of the State. We are by no means certain that they have really suffered through temporal persecution. Is not the Church of France stronger to-day than it was a decade ago? But every English Churchman is probably certain in his own mind of this—in each case the Church

managed things very badly. If only her rulers had foreseen the cataclysm so clearly foreshadowed, and had prepared for it, they would have saved much from the wreck of their property. That is probably quite true. And the English Churchman, as he looks at Spain to-day, thinks very much what he thought before in the other cases I have mentioned. If the Bishops of Spain, with the examples of France and Portugal on either side of them, cannot see the troubles that inevitably lie ahead, they must be blind. They know better than we do the causes of the trouble, ecclesiastical authority enforced by the aid of the State, the trading and underselling practised by the monasteries, the endowments of convents, and so on. Why, then, do they not begin to reform their abuses (if they are abuses, or if they are not), and prepare for trouble, and perhaps avoid it all?

Why not ? We see the advantages so clearly in their case. What about ourselves ?

Endowed Activity

Looking back dispassionately at the events of last year in the light of these grim and sanguinary days, does it really seem to you such a splendid thing—all that magnificent zeal and indignant enthusiasm called forth by the State's confiscation of Welsh endowments ? Do the Bishops and dignitaries appear quite so dignified to-day after their established and endowed emotion of yesterday ? Can the English Church be brought to life only by politicians snatching at her endowments ? Let us hope the inglorious episodes of that peevish struggle are over and done with, and that we shall not live to see another outbreak of English prelates and priests hustling for their endowments. I fear we shall be overtaken like as France and Portugal. I see no sign that the spiritual peers of England and Spain are taking any steps to set their houses in order. Do the people love to have it so ?

What shall be done in the end thereof ?

Your Rights

If I have at all rightly interpreted your attitude towards the somewhat variegated questions which have been discussed, you will forgive me if in conclusion I say a few words about your position and your right of abode in the Church of England. I

had not the episcopal privilege of reading theology at Oxford, and consequently I shall not be expected to go very thoroughly into the matter. I leave that to some of yourselves and to others who are still reading theology at Oxford, and have not yet been called upon to exchange the impartiality of the common room for the prejudices of the Bench. You will not be without some very capable champions. It has for many years been the fashion among Protestants to tell you that your true home is in Rome. Ecclesiastically this is a truism, as it is nationally a truism to say that the Australians' true home is in England. Neither Anglicans nor Australians will be grievously offended by truisms. But they mean that you ought to be a Roman Catholic. The answer to that lies in the fact of its impossibility. No Roman Catholic Bishop would receive you unless you could in conscience state that you believed that all the present Papal Claims were always true. It may be no fault of your own that you are quite unable to give that assurance.

What then, are you to resign the priesthood of Ecclesia Anglicana because you hold and teach what St. Augustine taught, or Anselm, or Swithin, or Hugh of Lincoln ? The Bishop who questions your loyalty at an interview in the morning, in the afternoon will solemnly consecrate a new church, and place it under the patronage of St. Boniface, or other Saint in the Prayer Book Calendar. He will come and go in a motor-car for the possession of which he daily gives thanks to Messrs. Siddeley Deasy and the Continuity of Endowments. Fired by his enthusiasm for continuity, the vicar and curates proceed to teach the religion of Boniface and all the English Saints, and very shortly another episcopal interview will be granted, probably to the junior curate. He will first be asked, " Are you a loyal man ? " If he is, of course he will answer, " I believe in the Filioque, but not in the Holy House of Loretto." This might bring the interview to a close prematurely, or delay it until the Resident Chaplain had discovered Volume V of Harmsworth's Encyclopædia, and Part II of the Catholic Dictionary. So he probably only says " Yes," making a mental act of homage to George V. It avails him nothing. He is either dressed down like a schoolboy or sternly reprimanded for teaching the Invocation of Saints and practising the religion of St. Boniface. In the former case I trust he will exercise the privilege of an English gentleman and

withdraw from the Presence Chamber before his spirit is roused; but in the latter let him ask about the truths of the faith as taught by the whole Church, let him gently moot the continuity of dogma. How many English Saints or Doctors or Martyrs can be produced against him? Does the Bishop really believe a part is greater than the whole? What authorities can be quoted for the verbal inspiration of the Book of Common Prayer?

But I think I need not keep you any longer, for your case is really won—if only you will maintain it.

There was once a man called Charles Stuart, King of England, and Protector and Supreme Governor of the Church in England so far as the law of Christ will allow. He was a true son of the Church of England, and he sealed his devotion with his blood. Let me read you a quotation from a paper by Professor Arnold Meyer, read at a recent meeting of the Historical Congress.

> "At the same time, though King Charles believed in such institutions of the Church of Rome as indulgences, oral confession, celibacy, the cult of relics, the adoration of the Saints, and other points, he expected union with Rome to be the result of mutual concessions, and did not hold with mere submission."

Such was the belief of the man whom the English Church anointed as her Supreme Governor, and his faith brought him not, as you might perhaps have expected, into the Court of Arches, but into the reformed Kalendar of Saints.

And it is an instance of some significance and a proof of progress won, that as lately as the summer of 1915, the Convocation of this province by their own vote restored King Charles' name to the Kalendar, thereby commending to you his devotion, his faith, and his loyalty.

A.M.D.G.

THE SOCIETY OF
S S
P P
SS. PETER & PAUL